

Appendix A

PUBLIC OUTREACH SUMMARY

The Planning Process included a substantial Public Outreach Program. Materials that document and summarize this Program and the public input that was received are incorporated in this Appendix A. This Appendix includes the following materials:

- A-1 Public Outreach Program
- A-2 News Release for the Public Input Meetings
- A-3 Summary of the April 1, 2003 Public Input Meeting
- A-4 Summary of the April 3, 2003 Public Input Meeting
- A-5 Fact Sheet Distributed at Public Input Meetings and Interviews
- A-6 Summary of Interviews
- A-7 List of Public Presentations
- A-8 News Release for the Draft Plan

It should be noted that the size of fonts and graphics in the original documents has been modified from their original format to conform to the format of this Plan. These adjustments result in some distortions, smaller print and modified graphics, from the original documents.

A-1 Public Outreach Program

COMPREHENSIVE MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE SACRAMENTO RIVER WILDLIFE AREA

Public Outreach Program

(Approved by the Steering Committee on November 20, 2002)

Consistent with other planning efforts in the Sacramento River Conservation Area, this Public Outreach Program is intended to ensure that the Planning Process incorporates the desires of the public in conjunction with the primary consideration of ecosystem management and the operational needs and resources of the Department. Other recent planning efforts in the Conservation Area have included the solicitation of public input regarding the use of conservation lands. Much information was developed as part of those efforts that can be incorporated into this project. Therefore, this Public Outreach Program is directed to utilize this existing information whenever possible, while providing for additional public input opportunities regarding this Plan.

The Public Outreach Program incorporates the following components:

1. Review and consideration of public input received as part of other recent planning projects:
 - The Comprehensive Conservation Plan for the Sacramento River National Wildlife Refuge, currently in preparation by the USFWS.
 - The *Sacramento River Public Recreation Access Study*, currently in preparation by The Nature Conservancy.
2. Targeted interviews with representatives of local government, organizations and interest groups active in the Sacramento River corridor. Such interviews would include, but not be limited to, individuals representing the following interests:
 - Local governments (County Supervisor members of the SRCAF, planning directors)
 - Hunting, fishing, bird watching, boating
 - Scientific study
 - Property ownership
 - Conservation organizations
 - Water supply and flood control
3. At least two formal presentations to and the solicitations of input from both the Sacramento River Conservation Area Forum and its Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). Periodic, informal updates on the Management Plan process will also be given to the Forum and the TAC.
4. An informational presentation to the Board of Supervisors of each of the four counties included in the Wildlife Area
5. At least two public outreach meetings to facilitate direct input from both organized groups and individuals interested in the Wildlife Area. These meetings are planned as follows:
 - a. General input meeting(s) to be held at one or more locations in reasonable proximity to the Wildlife Area, following the preparation of an Overview Report that will identify the Wildlife Area, its history and the Management Plan process. The purpose of this meeting will be to receive input as to the desired content and public use provisions of the Management Plan.
 - b. Public review meeting at a central location, in proximity to the Wildlife Area, to be held during the State Clearinghouse review of the environmental assessment for the Plan. The purpose of this meeting will be to receive input on the draft Plan and the environmental assessment prepared for this Plan.

A-2 News Release for the Public Input Meetings



FISH AND GAME NEWS RELEASE

**Sacramento Valley & Central
Sierra Region Field Office
1701 Nimbus Road, Ste A
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670
(916) 358-2938
March 17, 2003**

Contact: Gregg Werner, Project Planner for the Nature Conservancy (530) 897-6370
Patrick Foy, DFG Information Officer (916) 358-2938

DFG Schedules Public Input Meetings for the Sacramento River Wildlife Area Plan

The Department of Fish and Game (DFG) wants your input for the development of the Sacramento River Wildlife Area (SRWA) Management Plan. The SRWA is located between Woodson Bridge and Colusa on the Sacramento River. Two meetings are scheduled to receive public input. The first meeting will be on Tuesday, April 1 in Chico and the second will be Thursday, April 3 in Colusa. Both meetings will begin at 7 p.m.

The Wildlife Area contains over 3,600 acres of riparian wildlife habitat in 13 sites along a 70-mile stretch of the Sacramento River. "We have a tremendous resource out on the river and we want to involve the public in planning how to make the most of it," said Paul Hofmann, a Wildlife Biologist with the DFG. "The Wildlife Area supports populations of threatened and endangered species as well as game animals and fish. It is a beautiful, natural area that has always been open to public use. Uses have included hunting, fishing, boating, bird watching and just enjoying the natural environment."

DFG has entered into a partnership with The Nature Conservancy to develop the new plan. The DFG will direct the plan process and will be responsible for the ultimate content of the plan. The Nature Conservancy will coordinate the development of scientific information and the public outreach program. Gregg Werner, the project planner, noted that the planning process will focus on:

- Outreach to local governments, property owners, recreation interests and the general public
- Identifying compatible public recreation opportunities
- Coordinating with managers of other conservation properties in the river corridor
- Developing a strong science base to guide future habitat management

The development of the management plan will be coordinated with the Sacramento River Conservation Area Forum and with the ongoing planning activities of the US Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Parks and Recreation on the Sacramento River.

The initial meeting in Chico will be held on Tuesday April 1 at 7 p.m. at the Chico Masonic Family Center, located at 1110 W East Ave. The second meeting in Colusa will be held on Thursday April 3 at 7 p.m. in the Colusa Industrial Properties meeting room at 100 Sunrise Boulevard.

For further information regarding these meetings or the planning process contact either Paul Hofmann at 530-934-9309, phofmann@dfg.ca.gov or Gregg Werner at 530-897-6374, gwerner@tnc.org.

###

A-3 Summary of the April 1, 2003 Public Input Meeting

Location: Chico Masonic Family Center 7:00 p.m.
Project Staff: P. Hofmann & P. Ward (DFG) – G. Werner & T. McCubbins (TNC)
Public Attendance: 30 persons

The meeting began with an introduction by Paul Hofmann, followed by a PowerPoint presentation given by Gregg Werner that overviewed the Wildlife Area, the need for the Comprehensive Management Plan and the Planning Process. Comments and questions were solicited from the audience. Hofmann, Ward and Werner provided responses to the questions.

A summary of the comments received is listed below. References are provided in bold italics to the provisions of this Plan which specifically respond to the comments received. References to information or discussion in this Plan are related to the Chapter in which they are addressed. For example, “Ch II” indicates that a comment is addressed in Chapter II. References related to proposed actions are related to the Management Elements contained in Chapter VI as follows:

“B” refers to the Biological Element
“PU” refers to the Public Use Element
“FM” refers to the Facility Maintenance Element
“MC” refers to the Management Coordination Element

References also indicate the Goal number within each Element and the Task letter within each Goal, as appropriate, that respond to the comment. For Example, “PU-2-b” indicates that Task b of Goal 2 of the Public Use Element responds to a specific comment. References are not provided to all comments because all comments were not incorporated in this Plan. A wide range of comments was received, some comments conflicted with each other and some conflicted with scientific information or Department policy. Additionally, some comments were not within the scope of this Plan.

- ◆ There is a lack of mapping and signing to help the public locate the property. Both mapping and signage will help to reduce inadvertent trespass. ***Ch II, PU-2***
- ◆ There is too much public access along the river. Public access along the river leads to trespass and vandalism. The Department needs to address trespass and landowner concerns. ***PU-6, MC-1***
- ◆ More public access locations are needed on the river and on the land. With more public access locations, the impacts will be spread out and impacts to any one area will be reduced. ***PU-4***
- ◆ Big public events like the Labor Day float cause problems with litter and other impacts. ***MC-4-b***
- ◆ The plan needs adequate information regarding hunting and fishing regulations. ***Ch V***
- ◆ How will the Department control the area with more public use? ***Ch VII***
- ◆ It is important to make clear the differences between the Department and DPR. ***Ch-4***
- ◆ Restoration projects have been inundated and washed away. Let the river and the property restore itself. More grasslands are needed along the river. ***Ch III***
- ◆ Local government lacks the money to provide adequate law enforcement along the river.
- ◆ Operating funds and staffing for law enforcement need to be addressed in the plan. ***Ch VII***
- ◆ A vision is needed for the river to maximize economic benefits. Perhaps the SRCAF could serve as a forum for such an approach.

A-4 Summary of the April 3, 2003 Public Input Meeting

Location: Colusa Industrial Properties meeting room 7:00 p.m.
Project Staff: P. Hofmann & P. Ward (DFG) – G. Werner & T. McCubbins (TNC)
Public Attendance: 19 persons

The meeting began with an introduction by Paul Hofmann, followed by a PowerPoint presentation given by Gregg Werner that overviewed the Wildlife Area, the need for the Comprehensive Management Plan and the Planning Process. Comments and questions were solicited from the audience. Hofmann, Ward and Werner provided responses to the questions and comments

A summary of the comments received is listed below. References are provided in bold italics to the provisions of this Plan which specifically respond to the comments received. References to information or discussion in this Plan are related to the Chapter in which they are addressed. For example, “Ch II” indicates that a comment is addressed in Chapter II. References related to proposed actions are related to the Management Elements contained in Chapter VI as follows:

“B” refers to the Biological Element
“PU” refers to the Public Use Element
“FM” refers to the Facility Maintenance Element
“MC” refers to the Management Coordination Element

References also indicate the Goal number within each Element and the Task letter within each Goal, as appropriate, that respond to the comment. For Example, “PU-2-b” indicates that Task b of Goal 2 of the Public Use Element responds to a specific comment. References are not provided to all comments because all comments were not incorporated in this Plan. A wide range of comments was received, some comments conflicted with each other and some conflicted with scientific information or Department policy. Additionally, some comments were not within the scope of this Plan.

- ◆ The plan needs to clearly define what public use in the Wildlife Area means and be clear as to what is permitted. ***Ch V***
- ◆ Maps are needed to help prevent trespass on to private property. ***Ch II, PU-2***
- ◆ The Department and TNC need to keep in close contact with County governments. ***Ch IV***
- ◆ The plan needs to differentiate between State wildlife areas, State parks and other public areas. ***Ch IV***
- ◆ The lack of access to USFWS lands is an issue and a roadblock to seamless management of the river area. ***Ch IV***
- ◆ The various State and federal agencies working along the river need to have consistent regulations. ***Ch IV, PU-1***
- ◆ Recreation activities such as fishing are economically important to communities like Colusa. The plan needs to analyze the economic impact of recreation dollars along the river.
- ◆ How will neighbors be protected from damages caused by the public and by wildlife along the river? The Department needs to develop landowner assurances before a plan is adopted. ***PU-6, MC-1***

- ◆ There is a perception that the Department is promoting endangered species. Is this the case? **Ch III**
- ◆ The plan needs to address channel maintenance issues. **Ch II, Ch III**
- ◆ Buffer strips are a technique to help prevent impact on adjacent property from habitat areas. **B-4, MC-1-c**
- ◆ Restoration should include trail access to the river. Better access is needed to have more people use the area. But with more people will come more litter, vandalism, etc. The area can deteriorate. **PU-4-e**
- ◆ There is a concern about endangered species and how they may impact farming and recreation activities such as boating.
- ◆ The plan needs to assess the cumulative impact of all agency decisions on properties along the river.
- ◆ There is a concern that restoration will affect river flows. Hydraulic issues need to be addressed. **Ch III, B-4-f**
- ◆ There is a concern that habitat management will result in the more stumps and snags in the river. Boats cannot safely travel up the river from Colusa any more. **Ch III**
- ◆ Fire is a concern if riparian areas are replanted or allowed to regenerate on their own. **MC-5-a**
- ◆ There needs to be a balance between management for ecosystems and management for other uses like agriculture, boating, hunting, fishing, etc. **Ch VI**
- ◆ The plan needs to fully address maintenance and monitoring issues. **B-2, B-5, FM**

A-5 Fact Sheet Distributed at Public Input Meetings and Interviews

Project Fact Sheet

COMPREHENSIVE MANAGEMENT PLAN

FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SACRAMENTO RIVER WILDLIFE AREA

Project:	The California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) is developing a new management plan for the Sacramento River Wildlife Area (see reverse side for map).																													
Project Area:	The Sacramento River Wildlife Area includes over 3,600 acres in thirteen separate units (see attached map). It extends along the Sacramento River for 70 miles (from River Mile 145 near Colusa to River Mile 215, just south of Woodson Bridge). The property was acquired by the State of California for the conservation of riparian wildlife habitat.																													
Purpose:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- To effectively guide the Department of Fish and Game’s management of the Wildlife Area, consistent with the mission of the Department and the principles of the Sacramento River Conservation Area Handbook- To provide for public recreation use of the Wildlife Area while maintaining the habitat values of the Area.																													
Project Development:	DFG has entered into a partnership with The Nature Conservancy (TNC) to help develop the Comprehensive Management Plan. DFG and TNC will pool their resources to develop the plan. DFG will make all decisions regarding the content of the Plan. TNC will draw from the scientific information and data that it has developed over the past fifteen years as part of its Sacramento River Project to assist DFG in developing a plan that reflects the ecosystem management objectives of the Sacramento River Conservation Area.																													
Public Outreach:	The project will include public input meetings, interviews with interest group and property ownership representatives, presentations to local government and coordination with other public agencies and private entities that manage property along the river.																													
Schedule:	The project was initiated in the August of 2002 and completion is scheduled for February of 2004.																													
Project Contacts:	<table><tr><td colspan="3">Department of Fish and Game</td></tr><tr><td>Paul Hofmann, Region 2</td><td>phofmann@dfg.ca.gov</td><td>530-934-9309</td></tr><tr><td>Paul Ward, Region 2</td><td>pward@dfg.ca.gov</td><td>530-895-5015</td></tr><tr><td>Teresa Le Blanc, Lands and Facilities</td><td>tlablanc@dfg.ca.gov</td><td>916-445-3499</td></tr><tr><td colspan="3"> </td></tr><tr><td colspan="3">The Nature Conservancy</td></tr><tr><td>Gregg Werner, Project Planner</td><td>gwerner@tnc.org</td><td>530-897-6374</td></tr><tr><td colspan="3">500 Main Street</td></tr><tr><td colspan="3">Chico CA, 95928</td></tr></table>			Department of Fish and Game			Paul Hofmann, Region 2	phofmann@dfg.ca.gov	530-934-9309	Paul Ward, Region 2	pward@dfg.ca.gov	530-895-5015	Teresa Le Blanc, Lands and Facilities	tlablanc@dfg.ca.gov	916-445-3499				The Nature Conservancy			Gregg Werner, Project Planner	gwerner@tnc.org	530-897-6374	500 Main Street			Chico CA, 95928		
Department of Fish and Game																														
Paul Hofmann, Region 2	phofmann@dfg.ca.gov	530-934-9309																												
Paul Ward, Region 2	pward@dfg.ca.gov	530-895-5015																												
Teresa Le Blanc, Lands and Facilities	tlablanc@dfg.ca.gov	916-445-3499																												
The Nature Conservancy																														
Gregg Werner, Project Planner	gwerner@tnc.org	530-897-6374																												
500 Main Street																														
Chico CA, 95928																														

A-6 Summary of Interviews

A series of 27 interviews (36 total persons) were conducted by the Project Planner to gather additional public input from stakeholders in regard to the Wildlife Area and the Comprehensive Management Plan. These interviews focused on representatives of local government, the SRCAF, landowner organizations, recreation enthusiasts, agencies active along the river, conservation organizations and other identified stakeholders.

Most interviews were conducted in person. Telephone interviews were conducted in situations where schedules precluded in-person meetings. Each interview included a set of 14 standard questions developed in conjunction with the Core Work Group. The opportunity to explore individual concerns of the interviewees was also provided. The list below identifies the name, representation and date of each interview.

Name	Representation(s)	Date
Christy Leighton	Glenn County Planning Division	January 27, 2003
Steve Hackney	Colusa County Dept. of Planning and Building	January, 29, 2003
Burt Bundy	SRCAF, Manager	January 29, 2003
George Robson	Tehama County Planning Dept.	January 29, 2003
John Merz	Sacramento River Preservation Trust	February 10, 2003
Pat Kittle	Kittle's Outdoor & Sport Co. Colusa Co. Fish & Game Com.	February 12, 2003
Yvonne Christopher	Butte County Department of Development Services	February 19, 2003
Bill Borrer	SRCAF Board, Tehama County Board of Supervisors	February 19, 2003
Van Tenny	Glenn County Irrigation Dist.	February 20, 2003
Denny Bungarz	SRCAF Board, Glenn County Board of Supervisors	February 24, 2003
Lance Boyd, Gene Clark, Matt Southam, Jerry Southam	Princeton-Codora Irrigation Dist., Provident Irrigation District	February 24, 2003
Dave Wombol	SRCAF Board, Colusa County Board of Supervisors	February 24, 2003
Sam Castillo, Steve Owen, Kent Harrison, Joe Powell	Department of Fish and Game Wardens	February 26, 2003
Stacy Cepello	Department of Water Resources	February 27, 2003
Rich Bottini, Sue Sutton, Jeffrey Sutton	Family Water Alliance	March 7, 2003
Jane Dolan	SRCAF Board, Butte County Board of Supervisors	March 17, 2003
Donald Odell, Ren Fairbanks	Deseret Farms	March 26, 2003

John Scott	Scotty's	March 26, 2003
Frank Townley	No Cal Guides Association	April 2, 2003
Pat Fitzmorris	Ducks Unlimited	April 3, 2003
Brendon Flynn	SRCAF Board, Sacramento Valley Landowners Association	April 7, 2003
Leo Edson	Central Valley Bird Club	April 9, 2003
Rob Capriola	California Waterfowl Association	April 11, 2003
Bob Strickland	United Anglers	April 15, 2003
Mitch Faro	Pacific Coast Federation of Fisherman's Associations	April 16, 2003
John Carlon	River Partners	April 16, 2003
Don Anderson	SRCAF Board	May 6, 2003

A summary of the responses received to the standard questions is provided below. This summary is not intended to represent a scientific sampling of public opinion or an exhaustive listing of all interview comments. The interview process was intended to convey information regarding the Planning Process and to generate ideas from representative stakeholders. It should be noted that all interviewees did not give specific responses to all questions. Responses noted as "*multiple responses*" were given by two to five persons and responses noted as "*many responses*" were given five or more times. Responses with no notation were single responses.

References are provided in bold italics to the provisions of this Plan which specifically respond to the comments received. References to information or discussion in this Plan are related to the Chapter in which they are addressed. For example, "Ch II" indicates that a comment is addressed in Chapter II. References related to proposed actions are related to the Management Elements contained in Chapter VI as follows:

- "B" refers to the Biological Element
- "PU" refers to the Public Use Element
- "FM" refers to the Facility Maintenance Element
- "MC" refers to the Management Coordination Element

References also indicate the Goal number within each Element and the Task letter within each Goal, as appropriate, that respond to the comment. For Example, "PU-2-b" indicates that Task b of Goal 2 of the Public Use Element responds to a specific comment. References are not provided to all comments because all comments were not incorporated in this Plan. A wide range of comments was received, some comments conflicted with each other and some conflicted with scientific information or Department policy. Additionally, some comments were not within the scope of this Plan.

1. Are you familiar with ecosystem management programs in the Sacramento River Conservation Area?

- ◆ Yes (*many responses*) **Ch III**
- ◆ Somewhat familiar (*multiple responses*) **Ch III**
- ◆ No (*many responses*) **Ch III**

2. Are you familiar with the Sacramento River Wildlife Area?

- ◆ Very familiar (*many responses*) **Ch II**
- ◆ Generally familiar (*many responses*) **Ch II**

- ♦ Vaguely aware (*multiple responses*) **Ch II**
- ♦ Not familiar (*multiple responses*) **Ch II**
- ♦ The general public sees public habitat lands as all one area **Ch IV**

3. What are important considerations that should be addressed in the Comprehensive Management Plan?

- ♦ More public access to Units (*many responses*) **PU-4**
- ♦ Need an information baseline **Ch II**
- ♦ Identify Special Status Species **Ch III**
- ♦ Sanitation at Units **Ch V**
- ♦ Compatible uses **Ch V**
- ♦ Habitat restoration to benefit anadromous fish **Ch III**
- ♦ Habitat restoration to benefit wildlife, not just plants **Ch III**
- ♦ Enhancement of fish and wildlife **Ch III**
- ♦ Coordination with other agencies **Ch IV**
- ♦ Maintain fishing **Ch IV**
- ♦ Snags in the river **Ch III**
- ♦ Fire suppression plans **MC-5-a**
- ♦ Understanding the natural river processes **Ch II**
- ♦ Don't make it too complicated
- ♦ Concerned about conflicts between hunting and non consumptive uses – may need to separate spatially or temporally **Ch V**
- ♦ Should be special consideration for special status species **B-2**
- ♦ Trespass and vandalism on adjoining private land (*multiple responses*) **PU-6, MC-1**
- ♦ Potential flooding impacts of restoration – cumulative impacts (*many responses*) **Ch III, B-4-f**
- ♦ How much habitat is enough **Ch IV**
- ♦ Tax impact on local governments and local economic impact (*multiple responses*)
- ♦ Impact on local sheriff departments (*multiple responses*) **PU-6, MC-4**
- ♦ Defining boundaries **Ch II**
- ♦ Enforcement and monitoring **PU-6**
- ♦ Depredation of adjoining crops (*multiple responses*) **MC-1**
- ♦ Concern with potential limitations on spraying adjoining lands (*multiple responses*) **MC-1**
- ♦ Concern with potential spread of endangered species **MC-1**
- ♦ Problem with not removing abandoned orchards **Ch III, B-4**
- ♦ Dumping **PU-6, FM-5**
- ♦ Meth labs **PU-6, MC-4**
- ♦ Review the Wildlife Area regulations **Ch V**
- ♦ Include all DFG properties in SRCA in the plan

4. What individual, groups or agencies should be included in the Comprehensive Management Plan process?

- ♦ Numerous individuals and groups were recommended **Ch I**
- ♦ Chico-based public access group **Ch I**
- ♦ Local Boards of Supervisors (*multiple responses*) **Ch I, Ch IV**
- ♦ County Fish and Game Commissions (*multiple responses*) **Ch I, Ch IV**
- ♦ Local irrigation and drainage districts **Ch I**
- ♦ State and federal legislators
- ♦ Family Water Alliance **Ch I**
- ♦ Farm Bureau
- ♦ Nor Cal Guides **Ch I**
- ♦ Sportsman's groups **Ch I**
- ♦ PRBO
- ♦ Boy Scouts

5. Do you have any concerns with the past management of the Sacramento River Wildlife Area?

- ◆ No (*multiple responses*)
- ◆ There has been a lack of management (*multiple responses*)
- ◆ Not much proactive management **Ch VI**
- ◆ Lack of funding (*multiple responses*) **Ch VII**
- ◆ A public outreach program is needed **Ch I, Ch V, PU-2**
- ◆ Lack of site access - more land access needed **PU-4**
- ◆ Lack of access control **FM-1**
- ◆ Absentee ownership
- ◆ Restoration planting **Ch III**
- ◆ Illegal hunting and dumping **PU-6, FM-5**
- ◆ Increased public access and use has caused problems **PU-6, MC-1**
- ◆ DFG's partnering with TNC is a concern **Ch I**
- ◆ Lack of notice to neighbors & local Boards of Supervisors **Ch I, Ch IV, MC-1**
- ◆ Less problems with DFG – can work out problems with wardens
- ◆ Need more wardens – poaching a problem (*multiple responses*) **Ch VII, PU-6,**
- ◆ Inability to control access **FM-1**
- ◆ Need more public information on regulations **Ch V, PU-2**
- ◆ Not familiar with past management **Ch V, Ch VII**

6. Public uses in the Wildlife Area must be balanced against the preservation of the habitat values in the Area. Has this balance been appropriately struck in the past?

- ◆ Reasonably balanced (*many responses*)
- ◆ Balanced as far as I know
- ◆ DFG has done better in the past than other agencies
- ◆ Need to limit public access **Ch V**
- ◆ Perception has been that benefit is for habitat not for people **Ch V**
- ◆ Water flows have been neglected by DWR and Bureau of Reclamation
- ◆ There is very little public knowledge or access **Ch V, PU-2**

7. What public uses do you think should be permitted in the Sacramento River Wildlife Area?

- ◆ Permit a wide range of uses (*multiple responses*) **Ch V**
- ◆ Fishing (*many responses*) **Ch V**
- ◆ Hunting (*many responses*) **Ch V**
- ◆ Spring turkey hunting (*multiple responses*) **Ch V**
- ◆ Hiking (*multiple responses*) **Ch V**
- ◆ Bird watching (*multiple responses*) **Ch V**
- ◆ Picnicking **Ch V**
- ◆ Photography **Ch V**
- ◆ Non consumptive recreation uses (*multiple responses*) **Ch V**
- ◆ Keep hunting reasonable **Ch V**
- ◆ Annual equestrian event by permit **Ch V**
- ◆ Overnight camping (*multiple responses*) **Ch V**
- ◆ Family type recreation **Ch V**
- ◆ Depends on the site access **Ch V**
- ◆ Appropriate as is – keep existing uses (*multiple responses*) **Ch V**

8. What public uses do you think should be precluded in the Sacramento River Wildlife Area?

- ◆ Vehicular access (*many responses*) **FM-1**
- ◆ Motorcycles and ATVs (*multiple responses*) **Ch V**
- ◆ Camping, except on gravel bars (*multiple responses*) **Ch V**
- ◆ Appropriate as is **Ch V**
- ◆ Intense recreation **Ch V**
- ◆ Continue to limit hunting to archery and shotguns (*multiple responses*) **Ch V**
- ◆ Preclude hunting in the Pine Creek East Subunit

- ♦ Fires, except on gravel bars *Ch V*
 - ♦ Mountain bikes, except on trails
 - ♦ Horses
 - ♦ Concern with deer hunting
 - ♦ Preclude rifles in the Merrill's Landing Wildlife Area *PU-1-a*
 - ♦ Personal watercraft
 - ♦ Group activities *Ch V*
 - ♦ Things that require lighting or electricity
- 9. Of the 21 separate properties in the Wildlife Area, all are accessible from the river and five of the properties are accessible by public road. Is more public access needed? If "Yes", what kind and where?**
- ♦ Yes (*many responses*) *Ch V, PU-4*
 - ♦ No more access (*multiple responses*)
 - ♦ Limiting access will help retain environmental quality (*multiple responses*)
 - ♦ Look on a case-by-case basis (*multiple responses*) *Ch V, PU-4*
 - ♦ Access needed to demonstrate benefits to locals *Ch V, PU-4*
 - ♦ Both good and bad – problems with trash and parking *Ch V, PU-4*
 - ♦ Concerned about agricultural spraying and notice
 - ♦ Leave it up to the adjoining owners who sell the access rights *PU-4-a*
- 10. The Sacramento River Wildlife Area is almost completely unimproved. Should recreation improvements be provided? If "Yes", what kind of improvements?**
- ♦ No improvements (*many responses*) *Ch V*
 - ♦ Depends on the site (*multiple responses*) *Ch V, PU-3, 4*
 - ♦ Yes – improvements need publicity *PU-2*
 - ♦ Not something that government needs to provide
 - ♦ Signing is needed, on land and on the river (*multiple responses*) *PU-3*
 - ♦ Primitive parking areas – trailheads (*multiple responses*) *PU-4-d*
 - ♦ Primitive trails (*multiple responses*) *PU-4-e*
 - ♦ Consider Americans with Disabilities Act impact *Ch V, PU-4-h*
 - ♦ Be selective – put improvements near population (*multiple responses*) *Ch V, PU-4*
 - ♦ One site should have access and facilities
 - ♦ Let public use dictate *Ch V, PU-4*
 - ♦ Possibly provide restrooms at key locations
 - ♦ Trashcans
 - ♦ Floating restrooms, like lakes
 - ♦ Only improvements that can tolerate flooding *Ch V*
 - ♦ Combination visitors / interpretive center *MC-2-b*
 - ♦ Facilities for canoes *Ch V*
 - ♦ More boat ramps needed *Ch V*
 - ♦ State DPR should do that , not DFG *Ch IV*
- 11. Should native, riparian vegetation be restored on parts of the Sacramento River Wildlife Area that are not now in such vegetation, in order to better support the wildlife that depends on this habitat?**
- ♦ Yes (*many responses*) *Ch III, B-4*
 - ♦ Yes, in the Inner River Zone *Ch III, B-4*
 - ♦ Very important for fish *Ch III*
 - ♦ Need grasslands – not all jungle *Ch III*
 - ♦ OK if not good economic units for farming & not affecting other landowners negatively
 - ♦ Replicating native habitats is not the best way to go
 - ♦ If affordable and practical
 - ♦ Depends on the location *Ch III*
 - ♦ Too expensive

- ◆ No restoration outside of the levees **Ch II**
- ◆ No restoration until baseline and cumulative impact studies are completed
- ◆ Need to prioritize restoration of existing lands **Ch III, B-4**
- ◆ No increase in flood levels should be permitted **Ch III, B-4-f**
- ◆ Think that the habitat will restore itself without replanting projects – let nature take its course (*multiple responses*) **Ch III**
- ◆ No more restoration until mitigation through a good neighbor policy
- ◆ Concerned about potential flooding impact (*many responses*) **Ch-III, B-4-f**
- ◆ Need to allow natural river meander **B-3**
- ◆ Opposed to more river meander
- ◆ Restoration should be restricted like agriculture

12. Should additional flood-prone land along the river be acquired from willing sellers to expand the Wildlife Area?

- ◆ Yes (*many responses*) **Ch III, B-1**
- ◆ Yes, if the site has public access **Ch III, B-1**
- ◆ Yes, within 2.5 year floodplain **Ch III, B-1**
- ◆ Yes, consistent with the Handbook **Ch III, B-1**
- ◆ Acquisitions need to be linked to other lands and activities **Ch III**
- ◆ No (*multiple responses*)
- ◆ Only from willing sellers **Ch II, B-1**
- ◆ There needs to be a plan for the use of the site first **Ch V**
- ◆ Need to take care of existing land first **Ch I & VII**
- ◆ Mixed feelings
- ◆ Not without guaranteed in-lieu property tax payments
- ◆ Needs more public input and County Board of Supervisors review (*multiple responses*) **MC-1**
- ◆ Should have seller sign a statement indicating why sold
- ◆ Keep multiple agency ownership **Ch IV**
- ◆ Would like to see a program for private owners to maintain habitat **B-6**
- ◆ Must be open to public use **Ch V**

13. If you could direct any change to the management of the Sacramento River Wildlife Area what would it be?

- ◆ Increase Public access to build a constituency **PU-4**
- ◆ Need adequate funding for management of the Wildlife Area (*multiple responses*) **Ch VII**
- ◆ Need regular staffing **Ch VII**
- ◆ Need to ensure in-lieu tax payments to local governments
- ◆ Need to replace cash flow for farmers and local economy
- ◆ Wildlife Area managers need more expertise and oversight **Ch VII**
- ◆ Ensure dependable, consistent river flow (*multiple responses*) **Ch III, B-1-d**
- ◆ Better monitoring and management **Ch VI**
- ◆ Centralize under one manager **Ch VII**
- ◆ Area needs a dedicated warden **Ch VII**
- ◆ Area needs a maintenance budget **Ch VII**
- ◆ Need more public review **Ch I, B-1-a, MC-1**
- ◆ Need more concern for neighboring landowners **MC-1**
- ◆ Don't infringe on adjoining landowners **MC-1**
- ◆ Move cautiously with major changes
- ◆ DFG doing a good job (*multiple responses*)
- ◆ Need signage to identify sites (*multiple responses*) **PU-3**
- ◆ Open all areas to public use and put in facilities where reasonable **Ch V**
- ◆ Provide money for fire and flood damage
- ◆ Replace lost local revenues
- ◆ Provide more support for recreation uses and tourism **Ch V, Ch VII**

14. Do you have any other comments or ideas regarding the Wildlife Area?

- ◆ Need to integrate all DFG lands in the plan (Mouth of Cottonwood Creek and Battle Creek Wildlife Areas) *Ch IV*
- ◆ Need to duplicate and expand the salmon rearing habitats *B-4*
- ◆ Develop some high intensity areas for locals
- ◆ Need maps, brochures to get the word out and help people locate areas (*multiple responses*) *PU-2*
- ◆ Don't advertise the area too much
- ◆ Develop a specific plan for each site
- ◆ Need more coordination between the agencies *Ch IV*
- ◆ Only local people should be considered stakeholders
- ◆ Find it irregular and inappropriate to have TNC prepare the plan for DFG
- ◆ Need more boat ramps *Ch V*
- ◆ Concerned that DFG may put wells in the Wildlife Area
- ◆ DFG needs a good description of the property it owns *Ch II*
- ◆ Money can best be spent on multi-species vs. single species approach *Ch III*

A-7 List of Public Presentations

Nine public information presentations were made on the Comprehensive Management Plan to various local government bodies and local organizations. These presentations included a narrated PowerPoint presentation, or if timing did not permit, the narrated presentation of a hard copy of the PowerPoint. Questions and comments were solicited. Each presentation was attended by the Project Planner and either a Wildlife or Fisheries Biologist.

The following presentations occurred during the Planning Process:

Audience	Date
SRCAF Board of Directors	March 3, 2003
SRCAF Technical Advisory Committee	April 4, 2003
Glenn County Board of Supervisors	April 15, 2003
Tehama County Board of Supervisors	April, 22, 2003
Colusa County Board of Supervisors	May 6, 2003
Tehama County Fish and Game Commission	May 13, 2003
Glenn County Fish and Game Commission	June 12, 2003
Colusa County Fish and Game Commission	July 1, 2003
Butte County Fish and Game Commission	July 7, 2003
SRCAF Board of Directors	December 4, 2003

A-8 News Release for the Draft Plan



FISH AND GAME NEWS RELEASE

**Sacramento Valley & Central
Sierra Region Field Office
1701 Nimbus Road, Ste A
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670
(916) 358-2938
November 17, 2003**

Contact: Gregg Werner, Project Planner for The Nature Conservancy (530) 897-6374
Patrick Foy, DFG Information Officer (916) 358-2938

DFG Releases Draft Comprehensive Management Plan for the Sacramento River Wildlife Area for Public Review and Schedules Public Input Meetings

The California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) wants your input on the draft Comprehensive Management Plan for the Sacramento River Wildlife Area (SRWA). The SRWA is a 3770 acre natural area located along the Sacramento River between Woodson Bridge and Colusa. The draft Plan is available on line at the DFG website (www.dfg.ca.gov) and at public libraries in the communities of Colusa, Princeton, Oroville, Chico, Willows, Orland, Corning and Red Bluff. The public review period for the draft Plan will extend until December 17, 2003.

The draft Plan focuses on preserving riparian habitat for fish and wildlife while providing compatible public recreation. The Wildlife Area includes thirteen sites that are home to special status species such as eagles and ospreys as well as many game species such as mule deer, quail, ducks and doves. The area also provides important spawning and rearing habitat for annual runs of chinook salmon and steelhead trout. DFG Associate Wildlife Biologist Paul Hofmann, the Department lead for the project stated, "This property is a rich and diverse area where we can preserve the natural environment and also accommodate public recreation." The draft Plan proposes to keep the area entirely open to public access for hunting, fishing, beach activities, photography, wildlife observation, environmental education and interpretation.

Because the public has been keenly interested in habitat conservation along the Sacramento River, DFG directed an exhaustive, public outreach process to develop information for the draft Plan. That process included interviews with stakeholder representatives, presentations to local government bodies, presentations to the Sacramento River Conservation Area Forum and advertised public input meetings. "We did a lot of talking and a lot more listening, and the public gave us many good ideas," said Hofmann. The draft plan features:

- A strong science base and an explanation of the natural processes that create and sustain the riparian habitat and its unique mix of fish and wildlife species.
- Extensive coordination with the other public and private agencies that are active in the conservation of wildlife habitat along the river, especially the Sacramento River Conservation Area Forum.
- A focus on public uses that are compatible with the natural character of the area.

Public Input Meetings are scheduled for:

Monday, December 1 at 7 p.m.
Chico City Council Chambers
421 Main Street
Chico, California

Thursday, Dec 4 at 7 p.m.
Colusa Industrial Properties meeting room
100 Sunrise Blvd
Colusa, California

Written comments regarding the Comprehensive Management Plan and the proposed Initial Study / Negative Declaration for the project will also be accepted until December 17, 2003.

For further information regarding the draft plan or the public input meetings contact Paul Hofmann at (530) 934-9309, phofmann@dfg.ca.gov or Gregg Werner at (530) 897-6374, g Werner@tnc.org.

###